

REMARKS

I. Formalities

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the Applicant's claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document by checking boxes 12(a) and 12(a)(1) in the Office Action Summary. However, the Examiner did not check box 12 in the Office Action Summary. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner check box 12 in the Summary of the next Office Action.

The Applicant also thanks the Examiner for considering the references listed on the PTO/SB/08 Forms submitted with the Information Disclosure Statements of January 31, 2005, June 12, 2007, March 12, 2008, and May 23, 2008 in the Office Action of January 5, 2010 and the Office Communication of January 27, 2010.

However, the Examiner has not indicated acceptance of the drawings filed on September 21, 2005. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner indicate acceptance of these drawings in the next Office Action.

II. Status of the Application

By the present Reply, the Applicant is amending claims 1, 4-6, and 14-19. Further, the Applicant is adding new claims 26 and 27 to recite features of the invention as disclosed in the specification. No new matter is added. In addition, the Applicant is canceling claims 2, 3, 7-13, and 20 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Accordingly, claims 1, 4-6, 14-19, 26, and 27 are all the claims currently pending in the application. Claims 1-25 have been rejected. Claims 8, 11-13, and 20-25 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form and to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101.¹ The present Reply addresses each point of rejection raised by the Examiner. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Applicant is canceling claims 2, 3, 7-13, and 20 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering moot the rejection of these claims. Further, the Applicant notes that claims 21-25 were cancelled in the Preliminary Amendment dated January 31, 2005.

The Applicant is amending claims 1, 4-6, and 14-19 to recite a map data processing apparatus instead of a data product. Support for these amendments can be found at least in FIGS. 1 and 2 of the original specification. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, and 14-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 14-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,951,622 to Nomura. The

¹ The Applicant notes that claims 21-25 were cancelled in the Preliminary Amendment dated January 31, 2005.

Applicant is canceling claims 2, 3, 7, 9, and 10 without prejudice or disclaimer, rendering moot the rejection of these claims.

The Applicant is amending independent claim 1 to recite, *inter alia*, features of claim 8. Because claim 8 contains allowable subject matter, the Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 is patentable over Nomura. In addition, the Applicant is amending independent claim 14 to recite, *inter alia*, features of claim 20. Because claim 20 contains allowable subject matter, the Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 14 is patentable over Nomura. Further, claims 4-6 and 15-19 are patentable over Nomura at least by virtue of their respective dependencies on claims 1 and 14, as well as their additionally recited features.

V. New Claims

The Applicant is adding new claim 26 to recite that the core portion has a rectangular shape, and that the overlap portion is adjacent to the core portion. Support for claim 26 can be found at least in FIG. 4 and page 18, line 17 – page 19, line 23 of the original specification. Claim 26 is patentable over Nomura at least by virtue of its dependency on claim 1, as well as its additionally recited features.

Also, the Applicant is adding new independent claim 27, which includes features of claims 2, 4, 6, and 12, as well as some additional features. Support for claim 27 can be found at least at page 22, line 4 – page 30, line 4 of the original specification. In particular, data 2-8 of FIG. 8 provide support for the

additional features recited in claim 27. The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 27 is patentable over Nomura at least by virtue of the additional features.

VI. Conclusion

If there are any questions regarding this Reply or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323, Docket No. 029267.55885US.

Respectfully submitted,

April 21, 2010

/Suzanne C. Walts/

Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169

Suzanne C. Walts
Registration No. 60,831

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS/SCW/hk
dn#11219603_1